



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,758	03/05/2007	Jikai Liu	570021.401USPC	5745
500 7590 06/08/2009 SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC 701 FIFTH AVE SUITE 5400 SEATTLE, WA 98104				
EXAMINER COVINGTON, RAYMOND K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/08/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/576,758

Applicant(s)

LIU ET AL.

Examiner

Raymond Covington

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification does not give any guidance as to the full range of conditions which could be treated or prevented using the instant claimed process. In *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (1988), factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described. They are:

1. the nature of the invention,
2. the state of the prior art,
3. the predictability or lack thereof in the art,
4. the amount of direction or guidance present,
5. the presence or absence of working examples,
6. the breadth of the claims,
7. the quantity of experimentation needed, and
8. the level of the skill in the art.

In the instant case, Applicants are claiming a method of preventing, for HIV. The nature of the pharmaceutical arts is that it involves screening *in vitro* and *in vivo* to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities. There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the

art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face. The instant specification does not give any guidance as to the full range of conditions which could be treated or prevented using the instant claimed process. In addition, there is no proof that the claimed compounds or compositions have ever been administered to a human or to an animal model. The obstacles to therapeutic approaches and vaccine development with regard to retroviruses associated with AIDS in humans are well documented in the literature. See, for example, Huff {*J. Med. Chem.* 34(8) 1991, p. 2305-2314} on page 2314. These obstacles include and are not limited to : 1) the extensive genomic diversity associated with HIV, particularly with respect to the gene encoding the envelope protein, 2) the fact that the modes of viral transmission include virus-infected mononuclear cells, which pass the infecting virus to other cells in a convert form, as well as via free virus transmission, 3) existence of a latent form of the virus, 4) the ability of the retrovirus to traverse the blood brain barrier and 5) the complexity and variation of the elaboration of the disease.

The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any vaccine or immunization treatment or any therapeutic regimen on its face. In addition, there is no established correlation between *in vitro* activity and accomplishing treatment of viral infections, especially HIV infections, *in vivo*, and those skilled in the art would not accept allegations in the instant specification, or the *in vitro* data to be reliable predictors of success, and those skilled in the art would not be able to use the claimed compounds and compositions since there is no description of an actual method wherein a viral infection in a host is treated.

In order to practice the claimed invention, one skilled in the art would have speculate which conditions could be prevented using the claimed compounds found in the instant claims. The number of possible conditions embraced by the claims would impose undue experimentation on the skilled art worker. Therefore, the broad terminology, treatment or prevention is not enabled because the metes and bounds of conditions which could be treated or prevented cannot be ascertained.

Applicants' comments have been noted and considered but are not deemed persuasive of patentability. It is noted that inhibition does not enable prevention.

Claims 1-6, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

There is no teaching or guidance present in the specification for preparing any specific hydrates or solvates. Preparation of specific hydrates or solvates of any compound is a very specialized, field and involves their characterization using different techniques such as infrared spectrum, XRD powder diffraction etc. There is no teaching or guidance present in the specification regarding any specific solvents used for preparing specific hydrates or solvates and their characterization using any techniques such as XRD powder diffraction or infrared spectrum etc. There is not even a single example present for preparing any specific hydrate or solvate of instant compounds of formula (I). While a pharmaceutical addition salt can be prepared routinely upon in possession of an acidic or basic compound, the solvate formation is the innate nature of a compound upon contacting certain solvent. Without any description of what solvent will form

solvate with which compound and completely silent of the existence of any solvate or hydrate, the specification offered mere language rather than possession or enablement of the solvates and the process of the disclosure failed to provided any enablement for a solvate or hydrate.

There is lot of unpredictability regarding stability of different hydrates or solvates of any compound in the art. In absence of teachings, guidance, presence of working examples and unpredictability, it would require undue experimentation to select specific hydrates or solvates of instant compounds with enhanced stability properties.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Padwa et al DN 138:170018 (2003) abstract and/or Murray et al DN 106:101992 (1986) abstract.

Murray et al and Padwa et al teach benzofuranolactone compounds corresponding to those recited in the claims. See, respectively, compounds RN 289673-95-6 and RN 106895-67-4 Other closely structurally related compounds bearing similarly related substituents, such propyl instead of ethyl, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as the results would not have been unexpected. Claim 6 would have been an obvious method as it is well-known in

the art of plant extracts to separate and isolation plants compounds in the manner recited in the claims. the rejection is maintained for reasons of record.

No claim is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond Covington whose telephone number is (571) 272-0681. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres at telephone number (571) 272-0867.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/R. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 1625

/Janet L. Andres/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
1625